

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,277	07/09/2001	Osamu Nagata	SONYJP 3.0-798	7556
530 LERNER, DAV	7590 08/13/2007 VID, LITTENBERG,		EXAMINER	
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK			PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M	
600 SOUTH A WESTFIELD,	VENUE WEST NJ 07090		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2627	
•				
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/901,277	NAGATA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aristotelis M. Psitos	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address -	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re- will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON a, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Peply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			•
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 J	une 2007.		
, ,	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ers, prosecution as to the merits	s is
closed in accordance with the practice under the			
Disposition of Claims	: !		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,34 and 35</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,34 and 35</u> is/are rejected.	i		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	'		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers	1		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	2r		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		ov the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			21(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	:		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		.,,,,	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have been	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.	
	:		
Attachment(s)	•		
1) D Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	n/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response of 6/14/07 has been considered with the following results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1,34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular:

claim 1 has been amended to recite in the ultimate 4 lines of the claim:

and when any one of the series of associations does not include the group name, the first special code of that association is disposed adjacent to the second special code of that association. "

However, the examiner cannot readily map/ascertain where in the specification support for such limitation is found. Appropriate response is respectfully required.

Claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 1 and falls accordingly.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1,34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

As presented, amended claim 1 recites a record medium – a product with:

Art Unit: 2627

a) group names,

b) program names,

c) program numbers,

d) special partitioning codes, a first/one of the code(s) for partition elements b and c from each

other, and another partitioning code for separating a from each other.

The claim (as now presented) includes a desired capability – " ... is capable of". The

examiner interprets such to mean that the disc is writeable to.

Finally, the amended claim in the ultimate 4 lines attempts to define the disc when a certain

condition is present. However, this does not follow from the structure claimed for the following reasons:

a) such limitations contradicts the limitations that precede these lines, i.e., group name is a define

condition that exists.

b) there is no capability/how the record this condition is present. There is neither any elements

(apparatus) nor steps capable of recognizing such a condition. Nor is such a condition the present since

the group names are already in existence.

Dependent claims 34 and 35 fail to clarify the above and fall accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior

Office action.

4. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 10-336579 further considered

with and Matsumoto et al.

The following analysis is made.

Claim 1:

MAT of JP document

A system readable and system writeable

a system is provided/disclosed

Recording medium wherein content is recorded and

that reads a recording medium

Application/Control Number: 09/901,277

Art Unit: 2627

From which content is reproduced, said recording medium comprising:

for reproducing the contents thereof.

a program area in which
a plurality of content programs, is recorded;
each one of the pluralities of content programs
being a respective portion of the recorded content;
and

area other than the toc

a management area in which management information is recorded, the management information including:

toc table

first management information for
managing storage of a plurality of program
names whereby a given one of the plurality
of program names corresponds to
a particular one of the pluralities of programs recorded in
the program area; and

see paragraph 24 of MAT/ group list/name

second management information for managing storage
of a plurality of associations between a plurality of
program groups and the plurality of
content programs whereby a respective one of the plurality
of associations associates a given one of the plurality
of content program groups with specific ones of the plurality
of content programs and with a particular one of a plurality of
group names.

program names present see paragraph 31 of the of content the MAT & secondary ref,

Application/Control Number: 09/901,277

Art Unit: 2627

each one of the plurality of content program groups being a respective grouping of the content programs, the plurality of associations being arranged in series using a first and second special codes,

the first special code being provided within at least one of the plurality of associations in the series and partitioning program numbers corresponding to the content programs associated with a respective one of the plurality of content program groups and the group name associated with that content program group, and the second special code being provided between adjacent ones of the plurality of associations in the series, at least a portion of the second management information being capable of being modified to enable at least one of the series of associations to be edited,

and

when any one of the series of associations does not include the group name, the first special code of that association is disposed adjacent to the second special code of that association.

In the above analysis, the examiner interprets that the primary reference/base reference to the JP document lacks the specific mentioning of information/ special codes for "partioning" as recited in the above claim. Since the record is rewriteable/recordable it is capable of being edited.

Nevertheless, as further taught in this environment by Matsumoto, the use/ability of having a plurality of special codes used for partioning all manners of information are found. See the above description of the "delimiting" ability in Matsumoto et al starting at col. 1, lines 15-39 further describing figure 1 and col 3 lines 5-9. The examiner interprets the Matsumoto et al reference for teaching the ability of having appropriate delimiters (special codes) for designating separate fields of attribute information,

Application/Control Number: 09/901,277

Art Unit: 2627

i.e., names, artist, music, tracks, etc. – see additionally col. 1 line 48 to col. 2 line 2. The partioning described in the secondary reference is not limited to non-continguous attributes.

With respect to the last 4 lines of the claim predicated upon a condition, i.e., no group name in existence, the examiner interprets this as a desired result and hence MUST INHERENTLY follow from the limitations previously recited in the claim.

Since the previous limitations have been met, this desired result, must also follow, else this desired result requires additional limitation(s) to permit such to occur.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are most in view of the above ground(s) of rejection. Whether the placing of the special codes so as to partition information adjacent to each other or not is not of patentable weight, i.e., the secondary reference describes the use of partioning codes for their inherent ability. Normally, information, group information is adjacent to each other, see for instance the well-known English composition capability of having Chapters and under such a designation, information drawn to those chapters found at the beginning of any book.

With respect to the limitation predicated upon a capability, since the record in the primary source is writeable to, editing is capable of occurring.

With respect to the limitation as recited in the last 4 lines of the claim, see the above analysis.

5. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 as stated in paragraph 4 above, and further in view of Tanaka et al.

With respect to the identification that the content includes audio data, such is not clearly depicted in the base reference.

The secondary reference to Tanaka et al clearly teaches the ability of having audio data associated with, included with image data.

The ability of defining the contents of the program area to include, contain audio information is considered an obvious capability as further taught by the Tanaka et al system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The dependent claim falls with its respective parent claim.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to 6. claim 1 as stated above, and further in view of Official notice.

Although not clearly depicted in the base reference, the ability of providing information with respect to the range of contents in this environment is considered to be notoriously old and well known, and Official notice is taken thereof.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system as relied upon above with respect to claim 1 and modify such to include the additional attribute of range information. Furthermore, use of partioning codes in order to partition such subsequent information such as range values, is obvious over the combined teachings, i.e., partioning of informational attributes is taught by the secondary reference, and hence partioning of subsequent attributes such as range values logically follows.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The dependent claim falls with its respective parent claim.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2627

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M. Psitos whose telephone number is (571) 272-7594. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday: 6:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne D. Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Aristotelis M Psit Primary Examine Art Unit 2627

AMP